Electronic Patent Application Fee Transmittal							
Application Number:	10713100						
Filing Date:	17-Nov-2003						
Title of Invention:	Pse	Pseudonymous email address manager					
First Named Inventor/Applicant Name:	Dick C. Hardt						
Filer:	Dilip C. Andrade						
Attorney Docket Number:	SXIP-015PUS						
Filed as Small Entity							
Utility under 35 USC 111(a) Filing Fees							
Description		Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)		
Basic Filing:							
Pages:							
Claims:							
Miscellaneous-Filing:							
Petition:							
Patent-Appeals-and-Interference:							
Post-Allowance-and-Post-Issuance:							
Extension-of-Time:							

Description	Fee Code	Quantity	Amount	Sub-Total in USD(\$)
Miscellaneous:				
Request for continued examination	2801	1	405	405
	Tot	405		

Art Unit: 2188

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office action is responsive to the amendment filed 11/08/2004. Claims 1-26 are presented for examination. Any objections or rejections made in the previous office action not specifically repeated below are withdrawn or have been overcome by applicant's response.
- 2. The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, any reference(s) known to qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 or 103 with respect to the invention as defined by the independent and dependent claims. That is, any prior art (including any products for sale) similar to the claimed invention that could reasonably be used in a 102 or 103 rejection. This request does not require applicant to perform a search. This request is not intended to interfere with or go beyond that required under 37 C.F.R. 1.56 or 1.105.

The request may be fulfilled by asking the attorney(s) of record handling prosecution and the inventor(s)/assignee for references qualifying as prior art. A simple statement that the query has been made and no prior art found is sufficient to fulfill the request. Otherwise, the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR section 1.97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this request. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this request that are included in the application's first complete communication responding to this requirement. Any supplemental replies

Art Unit: 2188

subsequent to the first communication responding to this request and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 CFR section 1.97.

In the event prior art documentation is submitted, a discussion of relevant passages, figs. etc. with respect to the claims is requested. The examiner is looking for specific references to 102/103 prior art that identify independent and dependent claim limitations. Since applicant is most knowledgeable of the present invention and submitted art, his/her discussion of the reference(s) with respect to the instant claims is essential. A response to this inquiry is greatly appreciated.

The examiner also requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s). in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 2188

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Venkitakrishnan et al. (Pat. No. 2003/0023794).

Venkitakrishnan teaches the claimed "integrated circuit" as single integrated circuit die 150 shown in figure 1 (col. 2, [0023]). The claimed "first processor with a first dedicated cache" corresponds to one of processors 101-105 and caches 111-115. The claimed "second processor with a second dedicated cache" corresponds to a second one of processors 101-105 and caches 111-115. The claimed "control logic" corresponds to circuitry including a snooping agent ([0031]. The claimed function to "transfer first data from the first dedicated cache to the second dedicated cache" corresponds to the function copy forward (i.e. cache to cache transfer) discusses at [0091]. Snooping logic (snoop agent) in combination with system bus 110 are configured to provide cache coherent snooping commands to enable the processor units (101-105) to ensure cache coherency between their respective cache units and the embedded RAM (see Abstract). The claimed "shared cache" corresponds to sDRAM core 130. The claimed "write buffer" and "fill buffer" could correspond to circuitry including In-Order-Queues (IOQ's) discussed in section [0050]. The claimed "multiplexer" corresponds to circuitry inherently found in the device of Venkitakrishnan

Art Unit: 2188

for transferring data from one cache to the other or from DRAM core to/from the cache or from I/O to/from the caches.

The examiner believes all dependent claim features are expressly or inherently taught by Venkitakrishnan. The dependent claim features, while part of the invention, appear to be well known and their relevance not essential to the main invention found in the independent claim(s). Thus, a detailed discussion of the well known claim feature(s) is not warranted at this time. For example, write buffers/fill buffers are generally well known features of cache devices. That is, data is presented to the cache maintained in a register/buffer and then written into the cache.

In the Remarks filed 11/08/2004, applicant argues the following for claims 1, 18 and 23:

Applicants submit that nowhere in Venkitakrishnan is there disclosed control logic that receives data from a first cache and transfers the data to a second cache.

In response, as stated in the rejection:

The claimed "control logic" corresponds to circuitry including a snooping agent ([0031]. The claimed function to "transfer first data from the first dedicated cache to the second dedicated cache" corresponds to the function copy forward (i.e. cache to cache transfer) discusses at [0091]. Snooping logic (snoop agent) in combination with system bus 110 are configured to provide cache coherent snooping commands to enable the processor units (101-105) to ensure cache coherency between their respective cache units and the embedded RAM (see Abstract).

Applicant has not shown or discussed how the claimed "control logic" differs from the "control logic" identified Venkitakrishnan. In general, there must be some circuitry Application/Control Number: 10/039,060 Page 6

Art Unit: 2188

to transfer data from a first cache to a second cache when executing the copy forward function or snooping to ensure cache coherency. Applicant should reconsider Venkitakrishnan.

- 5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/08/2004 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Please find the Examiner's comments above.
- 6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).
- A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to: Box AF

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office PO Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2188

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for Official communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9306, (for Non-Official or Draft communications, please label "Non-Official" or "DRAFT")

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack A. Lane whose telephone number is 571 272-4208. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7:30AM-6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on 571 272-4210.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571 272-2100

JAOK A. LANE PRIMARY EXAMINER